

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 15-17 and 19 now stand in the application, claims 13, 14 and 18 having been canceled and the remaining claims amended to more clearly define the invention. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 15-17 stand rejected for anticipation by Gallant (USP 6,122,501). Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 are rejected as unpatentable over Gallant in view of Michaels et al (USP 6,011,976). Claims 13, 14, 18 and 19 are rejected as unpatentable over Gallant in view of Ilan (previously cited US publication 2003/0171096). All rejections are respectfully traversed insofar as applicable to the amended claims.

Gallant describes a system wherein the mobile subscriber can enter a Special Dialing String (SDS) or Mobile Feature Code (MFC). As described at lines 50-65 of column 1, a problem which Gallant seeks to solve is that two subscribers in different locations may dial the same code and get different results, and the patentee views this as an undesirable inconsistency. So Gallant presents an arrangement where the translations from code to dialed number are performed centrally. As described at lines 54-63 of column 4, the mobile subscriber dials the short code and the mobile switching center then passes the received code to a centralized processing center along with other information, the centralized processing center translates it to a number to be dialed. The number to be dialed is then sent back to the mobile switching center which can then dial the number.

While Gallant does broadly teach the concept of having short dialing codes entered by a mobile subscriber and translated into dialed numbers, Gallant does not teach the subject matter of original claims 4 and 10. The subject matter of claims 4 and 10 is shown in Fig. 2 and described at pages 6-7 of the specification. By maintaining the database D locally at each control station, it is unnecessary for the control station to forward the short-code number to a central database (e.g., as shown in Fig. 1). Database maintenance is simplified and network traffic is reduced.. Gallant uses a central processing center 110 which is shared by multiple switching centers. Aside from other distinctions, the overall configuration is in this regard similar to Fig., 1 of the present application where a central processing station G is used.

The distinction is believed already clear in claims 4 and 10, but those claims have been amended to be more specific as to the maintaining of a database locally at the control station. This is neither shown nor suggested in the art of record, and allowance of these claims is requested.

As to the remaining claims, a feature of the invention is that the control station can send to the mobile telephone only those of the short-code numbers that the user is interested in. This is described at lines 13-17 of page 7. It was previously reflected in the language of claims 6 and 12, and independent claims 1 and 7 have now been amended to emphasize this feature.

In rejecting claims 6 and 12, the examiner points to lines 34-36 of column 6 of Michaels, which describes the programming of the SIM so that it will only receive messages relevant to a subscriber's needs, but there is no discussion of having only certain codes sent. This results in a further significant advantage relative to the prior art in that it may significantly reduce the amount of network traffic and the time required for the mobile telephone to download and store

the short-code numbers. It also provides for significant savings in bandwidth in a setting where, e.g., as briefly describe at lines 16-17 of page 7 of the specification whereby a user is automatically advised of short-code numbers as they walk around. This would in the Michaels scheme entail constantly broadcasting messages corresponding to all services available, with the individual mobile telephone only accepting those of interest. But the time it takes to send all of the dialing codes by SMS may be long enough that the mobile telephone would not be updated quickly enough. Thus, there is a significant advantage in sending to each user only those codes of interest, as is recited now in claims 1 and 7.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

An extension of time is requested, and the statutory fee is being paid through the Electronic Filing System.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 09/880,755

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/DJCushing/
David J. Cushing
Registration No. 28,703

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 10, 2006